



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/208,097 | 11/16/1998 | JOHN S. HENDRICKS | 5213 | 7677 |

7590

11/04/2002

ALDO NOTO
DORSEY & WHITNEY
1001 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW
SUITE 300
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER

KOENIG, ANDREW Y

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2611

DATE MAILED: 11/04/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/208,097

Applicant(s)

HENDRICKS ET AL. *W*

Examiner

Andrew Y Koenig

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-129 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-129 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 7.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-129 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
2. Prior art of record, U.S. Patent 5,477,262 to Banker et al. teaches menus related to a pay-per-view service (see fig. 6E, 6F, 12, 13a, 13b), which reads on the broadest reasonable interpretation of interactive service and a data services. Furthermore, Banker teaches transmitting the menu data for the interactive services and data services to the user (col. 8, ll. 45-60).

Priority

3. The applicant has supplied, in the supplemental amendment filed 19 September 2002, sufficient support for pages 20-28 and 52-72 in the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
5. Claims 21-22, 35, 37, 81-82, 117-118, 123, and 128-129 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
6. Regarding claims 21-22, 81-82, 117-118, 123, and 128-129, the instant application fails to provide support for an Internet Service Provider (ISP). The examiner

Art Unit: 2611

assumes that the applicant is referring to Prodigy, as disclosed at the time of filing.

However, the examiner disagrees that Prodigy does not necessarily constitute an Internet Service Provider. For the rest of this Office Action, the claims 21-22, 81-82, 117-118, 123, and 128-129 will be given a date of 16 November 1998.

7. Claim 35 recites "determining a method of upstream transmissions for the interactive and the data services." The specification merely discloses "only when given permission by the network controller 214 to do so." (see page 57, lines 11-12).

Accordingly, the specification appears to only use one form of polling messages, instead of the transmissions recited in the claim. It is unclear to the examiner how the claimed system can determine a method of upstream transmissions using only one transmission type. The examiner is unable to determine the scope of the claim and accordingly, no art rejection can be made for this limitation.

8. Regarding claim 37, the instant application fails to provide support for the limitation "managing the yield of the programs watched information for the targeted program so that the targeted program yields higher programs watched information" as claimed. Accordingly, originally filed claim 37 is given a filing date of 16 November 1998. Furthermore, Wachob, already of record, teaches targeting a program (col. 13-14, ll. 13-2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2611

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1, 3-6, 10-18, 20, 27-33, 38, 43-45, 51-56, 60-67, 66-67, 69-80, 93-85, 89-90, 93-100, 102-115, 119-120, 122, and 124-127 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,477,262 to Banker et al. in view of U.S. Patent 5,479,266 to Young et al.

11. Regarding claims 1, 3, 62, 64, 69-72, 101, 108, 119, 120, and 127, Banker teaches packaging programs and distributing them, where the packaging includes at least one program (col. 8, ll. 45-60), generating and providing menu information (col. 13, ll. 35-61; fig. 7-20), by means of menu screens, on-screen displays (OSDs), and messages. Banker teaches a terminal that stores menu information (col. 9, ll. 42-51), displays menu information (fig. 7-20), choosing a program from the displayed menu (fig. 13A, screens 32b and 32c), receiving the program, but is silent on switching. Young teaches choosing a program from a displayed menu, receiving the program, and switching the terminal (col. 7, ll. 24-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Banker by using a displaying a menu, receiving the program, and switching as taught by Young in order to conveniently display and select programs to the user. Banker teaches menus related to a pay-per-view service (see fig. 6E, 6F, 12, 13a, 13b), which reads on the broadest reasonable interpretation of interactive service and a data services. Furthermore, Banker teaches transmitting the menu data for the interactive services and data services to the user (col. 8, ll. 45-60).

Art Unit: 2611

Regarding claims 38, 52, and 55, see claim 1, Banker is silent on scrolling. Young teaches scrolling (col. 2-3, ll. 55-14), which allows the menu to exceed the size of the display. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Banker by using scrolling as taught by Young in order to provide and access information that is not currently displayed.

Regarding claims 4-6, 66-67, 85, and 89-90, Banker cable headend (fig. 1), which reads on an operations center, but is silent on a satellite receiver. Official Notice is taken that backyard satellite receivers are notoriously well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Banker by using a satellite receiver in order to receive a video signal in an area not accessible via cable.

Regarding claims 10-13, 53, 54, 59, 60, and 73, Banker is silent on highlighting using the cursor (fig. 7a), but is silent on designating the highlighted program as the chosen program. Young teaches selecting a program (col. 7, ll. 24-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Banker by using a displaying a menu, receiving the program, and switching as taught by Young in order to conveniently display and select programs to the user. Banker is silent on scrolling. Young teaches scrolling (col. 2-3, ll. 55-14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Banker by using scrolling as taught by Young in order to provide and access information that is not currently displayed. Banker teaches an IR

Art Unit: 2611

remote (fig. 3, label 312), to navigate the programming menu, and a select button (see fig 5), which equates to the claimed go button.

Regarding claims 14 and 74, Banker is silent on updating the menus. Young teaches updating (col. 5, ll. 57-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Banker by updating the guide as taught by Young in order to display current and accurate information to the users.

Regarding claims 15 and 75, 102-106, Banker is silent on the programming menu including a video window. Young teaches the use of a video window in the programming menu (see figures 9-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Banker by providing a video window as taught by Young in order to uninterrupted viewing of a program while browsing through the programming menus.

Regarding claims 16-18, and 76-80, Banker is silent on video advertisements targeted to a viewer based on demographic information. Official Notice is taken that advertisements targeted to a viewer based on demographic information are notoriously old and well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Banker by displaying advertisements targeted to a viewer based on demographic information in order to target the audience, which increases its effectiveness.

Regarding claims 20, 116, and 121, Banker teaches pay-pay-view programming (figs. 13a, 13b) which reads on a connection to alternate programming and mini-pay.

Art Unit: 2611

Regarding claim 23, 83-84, and 93, Banker is silent on teaching receiving information over fiber-optic and cable. Official Notice is taken the receiving information of different transmission mediums is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Banker by using cable or fiber optic cable in order to provide a diverse system.

Regarding claims 27-28, 94-95, and 109-110, Banker teaches pay-pay-view programming (figs. 13a, 13b) which reads on specialty channel subscription.

Regarding claims 29-33, 96-100, 111-115, 122, and 124-126, Banker is silent on teaches monthly and annual, first-run movie channel, sporting, full season and partial season, or favorite team subscription. Official Notice is taken that these different revenue models are old and well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Banker by using these subscription techniques in order to encourage viewers to watch shows that interest them and generate revenue for the supplier.

Regarding claim 43, Banker teaches messages, which reads on the program control information signal.

Regarding claim 44, Banker is silent on using the vertical blanking interval (VBI). Young teaches using the VBI (col. 12, ll. 64-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Banker by using VBI as taught by Young in order to make efficient use of the available bandwidth.

Regarding claim 45, Banker and Young are silent on a dedicated channel. Official Notice is taken that using a dedicated channel is well known in the art.

Art Unit: 2611

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Banker and Young to use a dedicated channel in order to provide a higher bandwidth signal downstream to the users.

Regarding claim 56, Banker and Young are silent on using the controls on the terminal. Official Notice is taken that using controls on a terminal are well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Banker and Young by using controls on the terminal in order to navigate through the menus.

Regarding claim 61, Banker teaches canceling from a menu, see figures 6F, 7A, 9, 11, 13A, 15A-15C, 17A-17J, 19A-19E, and 20A-20B.

Regarding claims 63 and 107, Banker is silent on using virtual channels. Official Notice is taken that virtual channels are well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Banker by using a virtual channel in order to provide information easily to the user, thereby allowing a channel selection to view information.

12. Claims 2, 46-51, 57, and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,477,262 to Banker et al. and U.S. Patent 5,479,266 to Young et al. in view of U.S. Patent 5,001,554 to Johnson et al.

Regarding claims 2, 46, 47, and 65, Banker and Young are silent on transmitting menu templates. Johnson teaches sending menu template for menu data (col. 11, ll. 41-58) and storing in memory. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

Art Unit: 2611

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Banker and Young by using templates as taught by Johnson in order to provide the user with a current menu, which allows for menu modifications and thus diversifies the system and increases robustness.

Regarding claim 48, Banker and Young are silent on an introductory menu template, a home menu templates, major menu templates, and submenu templates. Official Notice is taken that using a variety of menus is notoriously well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Banker and Young by using a variety of menu templates, such as an introductory menu template, a home menu templates, major menu templates, and submenu templates in order to provide the user with a friendly, and easy to navigate system.

Regarding claims 49 and 51, Young teaches a list of categories (figs. 14-17).

Regarding claim 50, Young teaches a list of program titles (see figure 1).

Regarding claim 57, Banker teaches a notification menu (fig. 11), escape menus, and return to program menus (fig. 7A). Banker and Young are silent on a program description menu. Official Notice is taken that using a variety of menus is notoriously well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Banker and Young by using a menu, such program description menu in order to provide the user with information pertaining to the programs.

Art Unit: 2611

13. Claims 7-9, 34, 35, 37, 40-42, 58, 62, and 86-88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,477,262 to Banker et al. and U.S. Patent 5,479,266 to Young et al. in view of U.S. Patent 5,367,330 to Haave et al.

14. Further regarding claims 8-9, 34, 40, 41, and 87, see claim 1, Young teaches program name, start time, duration (figs. 1-4), and a category (figs. 14-17). Haave teaches setting a price (col. 11, ll. 13-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Banker by setting a price for programs as taught by Haave in order to provide information for pay-per view services to the user and enable them to purchase the service.

Regarding claim 7, Banker and Young are silent on an operation center that transmits data to the headend. Haave teaches an operational center (fig. 1), which inserts local programming and menu information (fig. 5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Banker and Young by using an operational center as taught by Haave in order to adapt the programming specifically for the users.

Regarding claim 35, Banker teaches a headend controller performing continuous refreshes interactive services and data (col. 8, ll. 28-35); clearly the system of Banker collects the information in order to send for transmission. Banker teaches a displaying authorized pay-per-view events (see fig. 13A, screen 32b), additionally, Banker teaches a database in the billing computer (col. 7, ll. 60-63) which reads on inventorying the interactive and data services to be made available to the viewer. Banker teaches a system control computer that configures tuning frequencies of the channels provided to

Art Unit: 2611

the subscribers, which includes pay-per-view, which reads on interactive and data services. Banker displaying menu data for interactive services and data services (see fig. 13A), clearly the system of Banker must create menu data in order to format the data and send it downstream to the viewer. As per the discussion of claim 35, the examiner could not determine a reasonable interpretation of the limitation "determining a method of upstream transmissions for the interactive and data services" and accordingly no art rejection for that specific limitation can be made.

Regarding claim 37, the parent application fails to support the limitations addressed this claims. Accordingly, the effective date of the claims is 3 November 1998. Banker is silent on programs targeted to a viewer based on demographic information. Official Notice is taken that program targeting to a viewer based on demographic information are notoriously old and well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Banker by displaying programming targeted to a viewer based on demographic information in order to target the audience, which increases its effectiveness.

Regarding claims 42, 86, and 88, Banker and Young are silent on digital programs. Official Notice is taken that digital signals are well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Banker and Young to utilize digital programs in order to transmit high quality signals.

Regarding claim 58, Banker teaches a system providing services to pay per view (fig. 13A, 13B), but is silent on a program description, preview window, and cost to order. Young teaches using program descriptions, a preview window (fig. 10), but is silent on a cost to order. Haave teaches charging for services (fig. 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to display the cost of the services as taught by Haave in order to allow the user to effectively determine the price of the service.

Regarding claim 68, Banker and Young are silent on transmitting menu information and programming to the headend, and inserting the information. Haave teaches generating menus and a digital signal from an operation center (figure 1), see col. 2, ll. 41-69, col. 8, ll. 24-39, and col. 9-10, ll. 11-50. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Banker and Young by generating menus and inserting information as taught by Haave in order to compile information from a plurality of sources and centralizing the information, thereby providing better use of resources and information to the users.

15. Claims 21-22, 24-26, 36, 81-82, 91-21, 117-118, and 123 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,477,262 to Banker et al. U.S. Patent 5,479,266 to Young et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,025,737 to Matthews, III et al.

Regarding claims 19, 21-22, 24-26, 36, 81-82, 91-21, 117-118, and 123, the parent application fails to support the limitations addressed these claims. Accordingly, the effective date of the claims is 3 November 1998.

Art Unit: 2611

Regarding claims 21-22, 36, 81-82, 117-118, 123, and 128-129, Banker and Young are silent on accessing an Internet Service Provider (ISP) by selecting from a menu using a go button. Matthews teaches selecting an ISP (fig. 3, lab 86) from a menu (fig. 5, 7), which inherently uses a button in order to select. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Banker and Young by selecting an ISP from a menu as taught by Matthews in order to receive addition information.

Regarding claims 91-92, Banker and Young are silent on using a cable modem or wireless modem. Official Notice is taken that using a wireless modem and a cable modem are well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Banker and Young by using a wireless and cable modem in order to receive information from a plurality of sources; thereby providing information to the user.

16. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,477,262 to Banker et al. U.S. Patent 5,479,266 to Young et al. in view of U.S. Patent 5,940,073 to Klosterman et al.

Regarding claim 19, Banker and Young are silent on displaying an advertisement prior to the display of the chosen program. Klosterman teaches displaying an advertisement in the menu prior to displaying the chosen program (fig. 2a). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

Art Unit: 2611

made to modify Banker and Young by displaying ads in the menu prior to displaying the chosen menu in order to help ensure that advertisements are viewed.

17. Claims 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,477,262 to Banker et al. U.S. Patent 5,479,266 to Young et al. in view of U.S Patent 5,381,477 To Beyers, II et al.

Regarding claims 24-26, Banker and Young are silent on sending information to an online address and coupling the online address to the terminal. Beyers teaches sending information directly to addressed terminals (Abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Banker and Young by sending information to an online address coupled to the terminal in order to provide customized information to the user.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Y Koenig whose telephone number is (703) 306-0399. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (7:30 - 6:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile can be reached on (703) 305-4380. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 872-9314 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2611

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

ayk
October 30, 2002



ANDREW FAILE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600